



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCLXXVI.

NOVEMBER, 1879.

I.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE WOMAN QUESTION.

JULIA WARD HOWE.

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

LUCY STONE.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

JULIA WARD HOWE.

THE woman question, from the man's point of view, is very apt to be only the man question, after all. And the man, according to Mr. Parkman, questions thus: "Do we wish our women to vote? and, if we do not, what arguments can we find against their voting?" Starting from this point, with a zeal which can scarcely be mistaken for a candid spirit of inquiry, it is not surprising that very eloquent papers can be written, and a very plausible statement made, by individuals of one sex against the political enfranchisement of the other. Argument of this sort is no novelty nor rarity. The white man reasoned on this wise against the political enfranchisement of the black man. In fact, against every enlargement of representation many reasons have always been, and may always be, found.

"Those who vote already," it is said, "vote so badly. Why should we increase the number of fools who go to the polls?"

The danger of trusting mankind at large with the care of their own interests appears, and is, very great. The wise, among men as among women, are few. Culture, which quadruples the mental

power of either sex, is not possessed by any majority in the known world. Ignorance may be deluded and misled, may even be bought and sold. Volumes of argument are written and spoken in this sense. And yet, representative government in time always makes good its position and right to exist. One reason of this is that it not only founds itself upon popular education, but is in itself an education. Under its dominion, men are educated to their duties by the exercise of their rights. The greatest truths, moreover, in politics as in religion, are often hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed to the simple multitude. It soon appears that the dangers foreseen in the enlargement of representation are dangers to the exceptional privileges of a class, not to the community.

Representation is what the friends of woman suffrage demand for one half of the community from which it has hitherto been withheld. The slaveholder was formerly supposed, by a legal fiction, to represent his slaves. By a similar fiction, men are held to represent women at the polls. The slaveholders represented their own interests, and men, in voting, do the same. It might be said in both instances that the true interest of the two parties is the same. This is true in a sense so enlarged that few male voters will be found to take it in. The good of each and the good of all are really one and the same. But men, even while professing this as their faith, rarely exemplify it in their voting. In much of their social and political action, they will pursue personal advantage as it presents itself to them, in the form of some immediate gain, and will only in rare instances consult that larger conception of the general good which holds that what is best for the community is also best for the individual. And, even if men in general were disposed to do this, are they so wise that women should be satisfied of their ability to do it? Even from this point of view, Mr. Parkman's statements are not encouraging. He tells us that the best men among us naturally shun politics. All of our women, then, the best included, are subject to the legislation of a set of men whom he characterizes as "practiced tricksters," or as "hungry and rapacious crowds." And their knowledge of this state of things will, he thinks, induce only "the coarse and contentious among women" to draw near to the political arena. It is, to say the least, a singular method of argument to adduce the imperfections of government as actually administered, as so many reasons why good women should be satisfied to keep aloof from participation in any attempt to make it better.

A very short space having been allotted to us for the consideration of a topic which Mr. Parkman has been allowed to treat *in extenso*, we must necessarily be content to pass his arguments in the briefest review, though not with cursory criticism. And we must say, in the first place, that these arguments are already very familiar to the advocates of woman suffrage. In every suffrage convention, and in legislative hearings on this subject, each of the points which he tries to make is taken up and carefully considered, full opportunity being granted to those who think otherwise to bring forward their view of the case. We can not remember any of those occasions in which the advantage has not remained with the friends of the measure. A person who wished to be rude to an eminent literary man told him that her own father had always advised her to avoid a schoolmaster. The gentleman replied, "It is evident that you have." The tenor of Mr. Parkman's remarks makes it very evident to us that, in his study of the woman-suffrage question, he has avoided the opportunities of enlightenment which its friends would gladly afford him. When he accuses them of occupying the platform with "frothy declamation" and the press with sensational stories; when he avers that, instead of claiming for women what is theirs, "a nature of their own, with laws of its own, and a high capacity of independent development, they propose, as the aim of their ambition, the imitation of men"—the friends of woman suffrage may be sure that Mr. Parkman has neither attended their meetings, nor read the journals and pamphlets in which their views are set forth. He can not have heard William Lloyd Garrison and Lucy Stone—he can not have read George William Curtis and Mary Eastman.

Why should one sex assume to legislate for both? Because it always has done so? That is no reason. All the innovations which have blest mankind might have been excluded from use on the same ground. Because the sex which claims the right to do this has the stronger muscles? It does not use these in the act of voting. Because the sexes differ from each other in certain moral and mental characteristics? This would seem to make it important that the necessities of each should have equal representation in a fair government. Because there is, on the whole, a substantial agreement between them in feeling and in interest? This fact, if granted, would merely make it very safe for women to represent their own side in their own way. Because the political enfranchisement of the hitherto non-voting sex would overthrow the family? In this view it

is strange that the male advocates of woman suffrage are oftenest found among married men. Because one sex is military and militant, the other pacific and unmilitant? Do the fighting men of a community govern it? Woe to it if they do! Military rule is armed despotism. The solid sense of mankind to-day is against it. Because women have already possessed political power, and have abused it? This argument can be used with triple force against the other sex, whose abuse of political power is in large proportion to their use of it.

We have now breathlessly rehearsed the greater part of Mr. Parkman's objections to woman, or, as he calls it, female suffrage. Despite the narrow limits here assigned us, we will take time to reconsider one or two of them. The argument that women should not vote because they can not fight is a very threadbare one. It is an instance of that imaginary relation between two circumstances which leads the incautious thinker to link them together as cause and effect. What real connection is there between the act of fighting and the act of voting? A certain proportion only of the men of this or of any community are able to bear arms. Of these, a still smaller number will be called upon to do so, and that during a certain term of years only. Will those fighting men show any characteristics which shall make the ballot safer in their hands than in those of their non-fighting fellow citizens? The contrary impression seems generally to prevail among thoughtful people. The blind, unreasoning obedience of an army to its chiefs is felt to be at variance with the spirit of inquiry in which a voter should study the claims and merits of his candidate. Shall we say that the military are the guardians of the public peace? That office, in our day, seems to belong more clearly to the mother and the school-teacher. Justice claims the right to govern. Education enforces the recognition of law, the respect of right, the claim of duty. The agencies which moralize society are its true defense, its real bulwark. The merciful and patient work of women can spare more bloodshed to any generation than can the whole military order.

What Mr. Parkman says about sex makes us feel that the masculine view of this attribute, too often reflected in the feminine mind, is liable to great exaggeration. Like every leading attribute of human nature, it is either a weakness or a power, according as it is intelligently trained or blindly followed. When men intentionally use it as a power, they naturally desire that it should become a weakness in those upon whom they wish to exert that power. Sex

is certainly an important agent in human affairs, but not the most important. Its influence is easily exaggerated and lost. Men and women may have too much sexuality as well as too little. Society, if impoverished by the insufficiency of this quality, is also degraded by its excess. In men or in women sex is a power only when it is made subservient to reason, when thought and duty common to both sexes are brought forward and dwelt upon, uplifting both alike to self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice.

It is a great mistake to state the career of either sex as if its boundaries were necessarily definite and predetermined. Men are forced to undertake many things which are abhorrent to the ease which human nature covets. It is not their sex which leads them to do this, but some inner or outer necessity. Women are subject to these same necessities, and must again and again sacrifice personal convenience and inclination in view of offices whose performance becomes imperative. The farmer's wife digs potatoes in the field when he is too busy to do it. The farmer's daughter rides the mowing-machine when the men of the family are away with the army. The wife and mother, for whom domestic seclusion is made by theorists such a *sine qua non*, must feed helpless children by her labor, and support an invalid or profligate husband. Daughters keep aged fathers out of the almshouse. Sisters work at the loom to send a brother through his college course. In these cases the convenience of sex has to be set aside. The woman is obliged to ask, not "What is my sex?" but "What is my necessity, and how can I meet it?" The opponents of woman suffrage find nothing unfeminine in these acts, which tax the *physique* of the more tender sex far more severely than does the twofold effort of considering the merits of a candidate and recording one's conclusion by dropping a ballot in a box.

The liberties of women are necessarily abridged, in Mr. Parkman's view, by the dangers to which the unbridled passions of men give rise. He says, "A man in lonely places has nothing to lose but life and property, and he has nerve and muscle to defend them." In another place he speaks of the common theory that chastity is a virtue only in women, as one to which society holds to-day as firmly as it ever did. In both of these respects we think that a change may be not only looked for, but recognized, in the cruel manners of the world. Let us look at the first. The greatest danger of woman lies in the brutal sexuality of man. Her defense is supposed to lie in the chivalry of man. How shall she be assured, in trusting to

the other sex the defense of her honor, that ferocious passion shall not get the better of chivalrous compassion?

Existing provisions fail to give to woman this promised protection. Violence may dog her harmless footsteps in her own garden, may cross the threshold of her home, and find her there, as elsewhere, defenseless. Restriction of the woman's movements does not, then, prove an availng defense. The restriction must be sought and enforced elsewhere. The man can be taught as effectually to subordinate this part of his nature to reason and conscience as any other. If, as is claimed, he is the stronger party, let him be trained to show his strength in self-restraint, since self-indulgence shows only his weakness.

But chivalry is not limited to the domain of men. Its heroic compassion is also at home in the hearts of women. The growing concern of the best women for the welfare of their sex has latterly led, in many countries, to studies and efforts which tend to its true protection. The labors of Mrs. Butler (of Liverpool) and her fellow workers, culminating in such events as the Congress of Public Morality, held in Geneva, in September, 1877, have associated many noble men and women in a crusade against the low standard of sexual morality, hitherto held to be binding upon the male sex. When such men as M. Pressensé, of the French Parliament, and Mr. Sternfeld, of the English House of Commons, take part in the proceedings of such a Congress, we may perceive that a new theory and influence are already making themselves felt in the administration of public morals.

Touching the justice of the claim of women to the elective franchise, Mr. Parkman says that "government by doctrines of abstract right, of which the French Revolution set the example, and bore the fruits, involves enormous danger and injustice."

We answer that government which opposes abstract right is fraught with far greater danger and injustice. Granted that while the recognition of a principle of right may be immediate, its embodiment in practice will remain a matter of slow and difficult endeavor. When, nevertheless, the principle has attained recognition, the policy which looks away from it, and excuses the neglect of a sacred duty by the inconvenience of its fulfillment, is short-sighted in its wisdom and short-lived in its success. But a sentence a little further on puzzles us extremely. Mr. Parkman says: "It is in the concrete, and not in the abstract, that rights prevail in every sound and wholesome society." Is right in the concrete, then, opposed to

right in the abstract, and, where rights are enforced in the concrete, are they necessarily violated or neglected in the abstract? The woman-suffragists ask that an abstract right should be embodied in a concrete form, and Mr. Parkman replies to this by postulating a contradiction between abstract right and its concrete expression, which is valuable if viewed as a *reductio ad absurdum*.

To what authority can the concrete institutions of government appeal, if not to the principles of abstract right? The work which the French Revolution and our own essayed to do was to rectify concrete abuses by a return to the principles of ideal justice. While neither of these great efforts can be said to have been entirely successful, the measure of success which they did achieve is the most important attainment of the century which came to an end three years ago.

Mr. Parkman, like others of his creed, attempts to aid his reasoning by an analogy borrowed from the vegetable kingdom. "The palm," he says, "will not grow in the soil and climate of the pine." This metaphor seems to us peculiarly unfortunate, since man and woman, his pine and palm, necessarily grow in the same soil and climate. The question is, whether the pine shall make up his mind to allow the palm as much of the common soil and climate as he finds necessary for his own well-being. Or, rather, we should say that man and woman correspond to the male and female palms, for which every circumstance, except that of sex, is identical.

Mr. Parkman has no valid ground for assuring his readers that the granting of suffrage to women would bring into political efficiency women of the worst and most undesirable class, and leave "those of finer sensibilities and more delicate scruples" in what he would consider a masterly inactivity. In these remarks, and many others, Mr. Parkman shows a want of acquaintance with the character of the women engaged in the suffrage cause, which is singular, even in an antagonist. The question whether, in the case supposed, the vicious and ignorant would go to the polls, and the intelligent and virtuous stay away from them, is one often brought before a legislative hearing. At one of these, in which arguments on both sides had been heard, Mr. Garrison rose and said: "It seems to me that the present occasion is in itself an answer to this question. Here on the one side are character, intelligence, education petitioning for suffrage; and on the other are ignorance and vulgarity petitioning against it."

In his portrayal of the female politician of the future, Mr. Park-

man shows an unusual power of conjuring up, from the abyss of the unknown, unlovely female phantoms with which to electrify the minds of his readers. Let them not mistake this, as he obviously does, for a true spirit of prophecy. Imagination can create such forms at will, and can easily set imaginary female voters to destroy an imaginary state. But this is not its noblest use. The future, like the past, can be read from an adequate or inadequate point of view. He who fails to seize the sense of the present can give no true account either of what has been or of what shall be. The true prophet discerns the signs of the times, the deep, normal tendencies of human nature, which are ever more and more toward amelioration, and the greater good of the greater number. That the future of human society is to be more and more dedicated to the peaceful development of human resources, that the reign of justice is gradually and permanently to supplant the reign of violence—these are prophecies far more ancient and weighty than are Mr. Parkman's predictions about "the bad time coming." This reign of peace and justice will be greatly promoted by the influence and action of women, who have everything to gain from it. While it can efface no substantial feature of either sex, it will secure fair play to both. To borrow one of Mr. Parkman's antitheses, it will bring us the concrete embodiment of the abstract truth uttered by St. Paul, that in the Christian harmony there is neither male nor female, but equal freedom for either sex to bear its burdens and perform its duties according to its own best wisdom and highest resolve.

JULIA WARD HOWE.

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

WE read in Boswell's Johnson that when Boswell was drawing up, in 1776, a legal document which excluded all heirs female from the inheritance of a certain landed property, Dr. Johnson opposed the proceeding ; and, when Boswell pleaded ancient Scottish traditions, Johnson said : "Women have natural and equitable claims, as well as men ; and those claims are not to be lightly superseded or infringed. When fiefs implied military service, it is easily discerned why females could not inherit them, but that reason is at an end. As manners make laws, manners likewise repeal them."

It is the weakness of the stock arguments against woman suffrage that they are mainly based, like those of Boswell, on the sur-

vival of a tradition after social facts are changed. Reforms are not so often carried by pitched battles as by an unconscious change of habits, an insensible abandonment of prejudices, a new atmosphere of thought. You can no more replace the American woman in the position occupied by the Turkish or Hindoo woman than you can put the bird back into the egg : all that you can do is, to recognize the altered position and accept the consequences. From the Boswell point of view, each step is to be resisted, no matter how logically it follows. It was thought an innovation, in 1776, that a woman should be permitted to hold real estate in her own right. It may seem quite as great an innovation, in 1879, to let a married woman control her own earnings or to let any woman vote for anything. The same reply is always pertinent : in the words of Dr. Johnson, "As manners make laws, manners likewise repeal them."

It is not now the question whether woman suffrage would have been a project worth urging in the days of Charlemagne or Scott's Ivanhoe. Any form of popular government would in those days have seemed absurd enough ; and woman suffrage simply incredible. But the novel measure wears quite a different light when proposed in a republic already a hundred years old, and avowedly deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. It becomes quite transformed when we consider it as applied to a race of women who go unveiled and unguarded in the public streets ; who study or teach in high-schools and colleges ; who practice law and medicine ; who serve on boards of education and charity ; who publish books and deliver lectures ; who hold real estate by a tenure as secure as that of men ; who, even if married, control their own earnings and make their own wills. Grant that the woman of the feudal period would not have known what a ballot meant, if placed in her hands ; that does not prevent the modern, civilized, Christianized woman from both knowing and using it.

The strength of the woman-suffrage movement in the United States of America lies in this, that every axiom, every position, claimed originally as applicable to American men, proves on reflection to be applicable to women also. Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, once pointed out, in a speech, as a point which had greatly influenced his mind in behalf of this reform, that he had never heard a man argue against it for ten minutes without abandoning all the fundamental principles of republican government. These principles have never, perhaps, had a better statement than in Dr. Franklin's celebrated exposition : "That liberty or freedom con-

sists in having an actual share in the appointment of those who frame the laws, and who are to be the guardians of every man's life, property, and peace ; for the *all* of one man is as dear to him as the *all* of another ; and the poor man has an equal right, but more need to have representatives in the Legislature than the rich one. That they who have no voice nor vote in the electing of representatives do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes and to their representatives ; for to be enslaved is to have governors whom other men have set over us, and be subject to laws made by the representatives of others, without having had representatives of our own to give consent in our behalf."

Had Franklin, with his usual astute wisdom, designedly drawn his charter of political rights so wide that it should inevitably, after another century, come to include women also, he could hardly have succeeded better. Those who deny these propositions for men, or believe their practical working to have been a failure, will of course deny them for women also. The appeal must be taken from this minority to the great body of the American people, who still believe in a republicanism such as Franklin described. If there is any principle on which all our institutions rest, in the popular mind, it is that of the right of every adult person, not laboring under special natural disqualification, to take part in the government of the country. How valuable or influential a part the individual will take may depend on a thousand things—education, wealth, energy, industry, worth ; but no constitution can discriminate as to these things, and the effort to create inequality of rights on account of them has, when attempted on any considerable scale, always led to practical injustice. Nor has this injustice ever been more obvious than in the cruel laws in respect to women, now being gradually swept from the statute-books of our American States, but never seriously modified until, within less than fifty years, women themselves took up the discussion.

Either one must wholly take issue with Franklin's plain proposition, in which case one practically ceases to believe in republican government ; or else one must maintain that the fact of sex is a special and hopeless natural disqualification for suffrage. If so, where does the disqualification lie ? Not in character, because it is generally admitted that women are at least the equals of men in moral rectitude. Not in occupations, for those of women are not more absorbing, or more incompatible with the knowledge of pub-

lic affairs, than those of men. Not in inability to urge their opinions or carry their points, for their critics usually concede to women an almost unreasonable tenacity of will. Not in inability to form opinions, wise or unwise ; and be it observed that it is the habit of forming opinions, and not necessarily their wisdom when formed, on which enlightened conservatives have always based the arguments for extending the franchise. For instance, Dr. Arnold, in England, said admirably : "It is in vain to say that questions of religion and politics are above the understanding of the poorer classes ; they are not above their misunderstanding, and they will think and talk about them." For "the poorer classes" read "women," and you have the exact statement of the present demand. As public questions—war, slavery, free trade, civil service reform, temperance, socialism—are all at least within the misunderstanding of women, it is of absolute importance to the community that women should understand them, and all experience shows that there is, on these questions, no educational discipline like the ballot.

When we seek the historic evidence for or against the capacity of women for public affairs, it is curious to see that those who doubt it are apt to look away from contemporary facts, and draw all their arguments from the nation where women have been most systematically excluded from direct power. The keen satirist Churchill has written the verdict on the French "Salique law," in words which are of unsurpassed keenness, and still full of instruction :

" Women ruled all, and counselors of state
Were at the doors of women forced to wait ;
Women, who've oft as sovereigns graced the land,
But never governed well at second-hand."

Women can no more govern well at second-hand in Washington than in Paris ; but, fortunately, the fitness of many a woman for the direct guidance of thought and action makes itself felt through the press and through benevolent organizations. Those of us who are in middle life received our first lessons in political economy from the tales of Harriet Martineau ; and Mrs. Fawcett's little manual on the same subject is training the students of our high-schools and colleges. Garrison learned from Elizabeth Heyrick his motto "Immediate, unconditional emancipation," and Mrs. Stowe reënforced it with an influence such as no man brought to bear. In the age that has produced Florence Nightingale and Mary Carpenter, it

is quite needless to go for examples of feminine influence to the period of Montespan and Pompadour.

There apparently remains no hopeless disqualification that can be urged against women, except the inability to bear arms. The fatal defect of this argument lies in the fact that it proves far too much. If women are to be disfranchised for want of military ability, it seems logically clear that all other classes should be enfranchised only in proportion as their military ability is shown. The records of our medical department during the civil war, as tabulated by Dr. J. H. Baxter, show where this standard of enfranchisement would lead us. It was found that of 1,000 clergymen, 954 were physically disqualified from military duty; of the same number of journalists, 740; of physicians, 670; of lawyers, 544. On the other hand, of 1,000 iron-workers, only 189 were disqualified; of tanners, 216; of farmers 350. Even of the despised tailors, long the by-word of effeminacy, the majority were fit for military duty; but of the lawyers only a minority, of "able editors" only a quarter, of "sound divines" next to none. It is fair to ask, of those who apply this standard to women, whether they are prepared to accept its consequences—the virtual disfranchisement of the more educated classes, and the distribution of suffrage according to physical ability alone? The nation, it would seem, never quite appreciated the value of John Morrissey's position in Congress: tried by this new standard, he was perhaps the only representative who had the logical right to be in his seat.

And surely it is not so long since our great civil war that we have forgotten its memories, and lost sight of the military service rendered by women—service which generals and statesmen once so gladly recognized. To begin with, as Lucy Stone once said, "The soldier risked his life for his country, but in every instance some woman risked her life that the soldier might be born." Then, in the early days of recruiting, who can forget the courage, the patience, the patriotism shown by women? And, as the war went on, the vast hospital service, the immense labors of the Sanitary Commission, gave at each step a fresh vindication of women's usefulness in war. Mary Livermore, organizing in the Western cities her magnificent series of fairs for the Sanitary Commission, and then visiting camp and gunboat to distribute aid; Clara Barton, driving her wagon of hospital supplies upon half the battle-fields of Virginia—were they not serving their country in war-time as effectually as the bounty-jumpers and the deserters? The truth is,

that all this basis of disqualification is as obsolete, in these days, as was Boswell's theory that women could not hold real estate because they did not fight. As society grows more civilized, "that reason is at an end." Walter Bagehot has well said that, "in these days, mind without muscle has greater power than muscle without mind."

It was said of the American Federalists that they had too much of the wisdom of experience and too little of the wisdom of hope. It is too common, I think, for our educated men to share this distrustful solicitude ; and we may well turn from it to the more manly hopefulness of Frederick Douglass, born and bred a slave. "I am willing" he said, "to trust all the virtue of the community to take care of all the vice of the community ; all its knowledge to take care of all its ignorance. Therefore I am in favor of universal suffrage, and therefore I am in favor of extending that suffrage to women."

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

LUCY STONE.

FROM the ripened harvests of the last half century there have been garnered many priceless sheaves for women—the right to be heard in their own defense ; the right to higher education ; the right to the medical profession ; the right to the pulpit ; the right to the bar ; and the right to the wide fields of industrial activity. Odious and unjust discriminations against women have also been blotted from the statute-book, and wrested from the common law. In many States the old sin and shame which gave to any father, whether he was of age or not, the right to "will" or "deed" his unborn child, without the knowledge or consent of its mother and against her wish, has disappeared, and she may now be guardian of her own children. A wife is not now legally deprived of her personal property by marriage. She can own what she earns outside of her family. She can will a part of the property which she may have inherited or acquired. She can make valid contracts. She can carry on business and have the profit of it, if she make a legal record of the fact of her business—not else. In all these cases women have recognized legal rights which were unknown fifty years ago. These rights have all been won peacefully by argument and appeal to the conscience and good sense of the people.

Unjust and detestable legal inequalities remain, but their foundations are taken out and they must also vanish. Compared with the helplessness and humiliation of the former position, the gain of the present is immense.

The next point to win will be the right to the ballot. In any other country it would be necessary to show that political power naturally vests in the people. But here the whole ground is granted in advance. When our fathers came out of the war of the Revolution, made wiser by those seven years of suffering, they affirmed : "We hold these truths to be self-evident"; "Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"; "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

The Declaration of Independence was adopted unanimously by the representatives of the then United States, and the descendants of those representatives have held the same principles in theory ever since. It has been called the "Immortal Declaration." It has been read in every State on every Fourth of July since 1776. We have honored its authors, and the day that gave it utterance, as we honor no other day and no other men. Not only we, but in all the wide world round, men suffering under hoary despots, by a quick instinct turn their longing eyes to this country, and know that in the realization of our self-evident truths lies the charm by which their own bonds will be broken.

Article II. in the Declaration affirms : "All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for the protection and benefit of the people, and they have a right at all times to alter or reform the same whenever the public good may require it."

The claim for the suffrage of women is, therefore, not "a new-fangled notion," but a demand for the practical application of admitted self-evident truths. Naturally, women ask, if "all political power is inherent in the people," why they, who are more than half the entire population, have no political existence? Is it because they are not people? Only a madman would say of a congregation of women, No people were there. They are counted as people in the census, and also in the ratio of representation of every State, to increase the political power of men. They are even held to be citizens, without the rights of citizenship, indeed, but to bear the burdens of "taxation without representation," which is "tyranny." They are only not people where political rights are involved.

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the

governed"—not of the governed property-holders, nor of the governed fighting men, nor of the governed married men, but of the governed. Women are governed, and by the very theory of our government should give their consent: suffrage is the only form through which consent can be given.

What is suffrage? It is the prescribed method whereby, at a certain time and place, the will of the citizen is registered. It is the form in which the popular assent or dissent is indicated in reference to principles, measures, and men.

The essence of suffrage is rational choice. It follows, therefore, under our theory of government, that every individual capable of independent rational choice is rightfully entitled to vote.

The alien who is temporarily a resident is excepted. He is still a citizen of his native country, from which he may demand protection, and to which he owes allegiance. But, when he becomes a naturalized citizen, he is admitted to all the rights of citizenship, suffrage included.

The minor is excepted. The law holds him an infant. He is under guardianship as being incapable of rational choice until he arrives at years of discretion. Then he may vote. Idiots and lunatics are excepted because they are incapable of rational choice, and so can not vote. None of these cases conflict with the principle. But, when a woman is disfranchised because she is a woman, the principle is violated. She possesses every human faculty. No man would admit even to himself that his mother is not capable of rational choice. And, if the woman he has chosen for his wife is a fool, that fact lies at least as much against his ability to make a rational choice as against hers, and should put them both in the category of excepted persons.

But it is said the "consent of the governed" is only a theory, a "glittering generality"—that in fact the governed do not consent, and never have consented.

Yet this theory is the golden rule of political justice. The right of the citizen to participate in making the laws is the sole foundation of political morality. Deny this, and you justify despotism. On the principle of limited suffrage, aristocracy is blameless and republican institutions are impossible. Men who deny political rights to women can show no title to their own.

As there can be no argument against a self-evident truth, so none has ever been attempted. Instead of arguments, tradition, usage, habit, the dread of change, are all summoned to hold fast the

old ways. The love of power, of leadership, and of domination urges men to resist any encroachment upon the field they have so long held, not to say usurped. A Massachusetts Senator said in his place in the Senate, opposing the petition of women for the ballot, "We men have the power, and we will not give it up until we are compelled to." With less offensiveness of statement and of manner, this sentiment underlies and overlies much masculine expression in regard to the political rights of women.

Fine feminine qualities are quoted with masterly skill. The benign influence of these qualities is set forth in glowing colors: "It can not be denied that the instincts of women are preëminently delicate and true; that in them the moral nature and the better emotions are more apt to rule than in the other sex; that their conscience is more sensitive, and their religious susceptibilities quicker and more controlling. . . . They can, if they will, create and maintain higher standards of thought and purpose, raise the whole tone of national life, and give our civilization the fullness that it lacks; for, if they raise themselves, they will infallibly raise the men with them." All this, and more, is accorded to women by men who affirm that women who are indispensable and beneficent in the home and in the family, beneficent and priceless as teachers in the schools, and invaluable in the Church, will, if they share political life, make its turbid pool still darker, and at the same time all their own fine qualities will become sources of crime and vice. "Many women will sell themselves; many more will sell their votes. Three fourths of them, when not urged by some pressing need or contagious passion, would be moved, not by principles, but by personal predilections." The reign of queens who have brought immeasurable good to their subjects is quoted, with their faults of temper or their positive vices, as proofs that women should not have political power. But the reigns of dissolute, cruel, tyrannical, and incompetent kings, who greatly outnumber any similar class of queens, are not admitted to subtract from or militate in the least against the masculine right and fitness to rule. So much do custom and prejudice blind the judgment of some of the best men.

Samson powerless before Delilah is quoted. Is it as an added proof of his special fitness to hold the reins of government, and another proof that women should continue to be governed without their consent? But the great mass of women are not Delilahs; and, if men go prone before those who are, it shows which is really the "weaker sex," and ought to abate somewhat from the arrogant

claim that "man is governed by reason and not by emotion," and therefore better adapted to be the ruling power.

But all this may be left aside, and as much or as little weight added to it as one pleases. The facts to be considered are these: Women and men are in the world about an equal number—masculine qualities belonging to men and feminine qualities to women. These distinctive traits are a part of the eternal order and can not be manipulated by human hands. The interests of men and women are so involved that the good or evil of which either is the cause is inevitably shared by both. Government is indispensable to civilized society. Up to this time, the formation and administration of government have been mainly in the hands of men. What has been the result of this total separation of feminine qualities and power from the sphere of government? The nations of the earth have been engaged in almost ceaseless warfare. Bloodshed and murder, waste of life and treasure, have covered the whole field of masculine administration and sovereignty. National debts everywhere exist. Whole States are bankrupt and repudiate their debts. Men speak of the politics they have made as "a dirty pool"; an "ignoble scramble for place and power"; "a scene of bribery and corruption."

That this is so, lies patent to the most careless observer. But, when we look to see the effect of masculine legislation for women, we find that the common law, by a single sweep, blotted out the legal existence of every wife. It gave the "custody of her person" to her husband, and also the right to give her "moderate correction." It gave all that a wife could earn to her husband, whether it was the dollar the poor washer-woman received for her day's toil, or the price of the copyright of the books of Mrs. Sarah Norton. A wife could neither buy, nor sell, nor deed, nor will. The children she bore belonged absolutely to her husband. Every State in this Union has seen mothers fleeing with their children before infuriated and brutal husbands who were empowered by law to retake and dispose of both!

Most of these cruel laws have disappeared from the States where the demand and petition of woman suffragists have urged their removal; but they were made by men. Women have always been involved in all the consequences of wicked or foolish masculine legislation.

If men made war, the homes of women were pillaged and burned, their sons slaughtered, themselves and their daughters outraged

and murdered, and the natural toil of men imposed upon them in addition to their own. From the wreck of nations and the ruin of governments there has been no escape for women.

This subjugation of women, on the one hand, wrought endless mischief to women ; first, by leading them to assume, from the unequal and inferior position given them by the law, where they rank with idiots and felons, that they were themselves inferior. As a result of this came the tendency to be satisfied with trifles, and all the more so because it was manifestly more pleasing to those on whom they were made dependent.

On the other hand, the very position of law-makers and rulers increased the self-conceit of men.

“Woman is the lesser man, and all her passions, matched with mine,
Are as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine.”

This stanza expresses an idea still common among men. It has shaped itself in all our institutions—the college, the industries, the professions. Even in the home it created for woman humiliation and dependence.

The sense of superiority led men to establish a different standard of morality for themselves. They still hold that the same sin committed together by a man and a woman at the same time is less bad and less a sin on the part of the man, and that it “would be a far greater hardship to impose the same penalties on him that are now imposed on her for the same crime.” This idea pervades society like an atmosphere.

A little boy, whose mother told him he should behave as well as girls do, said : “Are you quite sure you mean what you say ? Don’t you know boys can’t be as good as girls, but they know the most ?” So early had he learned the lesson set by the practice of daily life, by the idea which blunts and blinds the moral sense and scatters mildew and blight over all life’s choicest things, and which furnishes one of the most cogent reasons for heeding the prayer of women for equal rights.

An undue sense of his own superiority, a contempt for the intellect of women, a lower moral standard for men, and a world devastated by wars, are among the results of masculine domination. They furnish abundant proof that something more and different is needed for the best good of individuals, of states, and of nations. But the only remaining things which have not been tried are

feminine influence and character clothed with legal power, and the responsibility which attaches to such power.

The case may be stated thus: Shall the men and women who are to obey the laws have a right to make them, or shall only men have this right? Shall men and women who are to pay the taxes have a common right to decide the amount and the use of these taxes, or shall only men have this right? What can be more natural than the answer that parties alike involved should, when of mature age, sound mind, and not convicted of crime, have a common share in a common interest? What is more reasonable to suppose than that the great mass of women who now bless the home, who are the life of the Church, who are the main educators of the rising generation, would bring good to the state if they had the opportunity? What can be more just than that the consent of the governed men and women should be given to the laws that govern them?

When any causes make women less than their best, society feels it to its very core and is less than its best. The woman who sits by her baby's cradle, having learned no lessons of responsibility and self-reliance, whose mind is narrow, whose arm weak, and whose heart is timid, can impart to that child only what she herself possesses. What is so important to the public good as that women, who are the mothers, should have the benefit of that self-respect and self-reliance which come with and are inseparable from the possession of equal rights?

Say that women are different from men. It is for that very reason that suffragists have always urged this different being must be represented by herself. Her feminine qualities should have expression and binding influence in a government where she and her children are invested.

Say that women are excitable. Weight them with responsibility. Say that they are busy with the care of home and children. It is by that very fact they are safe as law-makers. Men scramble for place and power. The strife may involve bloodshed and war; may cause the wreck of nations, and the ruin of every home tie; father, mother, wife, child, all go down before this absorbing love of power. But with women is the permanent factor of motherhood. There is not one mother in millions who does not think ten times of what will be best for her child where she thinks once of what is best for herself. Her care is of the baby at her breast, of the child tugging at her finger, of her young sons and daughters. She longs

to make smooth and safe ways for their feet. By a law which was not made by men, and can not be abrogated, the mother is bound to her child by ties which neither distance, nor absence, nor time can change. Every man knows that, however far or wide he wanders, or however he may cover himself with sin and shame, if his mother live her heart beats warm for him, and her arms will open wide with welcome. By so much the more as all others shut him out, by so much the more will she take him in.

This permanent relation must for ever, in the main, make the influence of women in the government a conservative one—conserving the interest of the family and the home, on the integrity of which depend both the safety and the permanence of society and of government.

The problem of American statesmanship to-day is how to embody in our institutions a guarantee of the rights of every citizen. There is only one way. Base government on the consent of the governed, and each class will protect itself.

Put this great principle of universal suffrage, irrespective of sex, race, or color, into the foundations of our temple of liberty, and it will rise in fair and beautiful proportions, "without the sound of a hammer, or the noise of any instrument," to stand at last perfect and entire, wanting nothing. Omit it, and only "He who sees the end from the beginning" knows by what lessons of losses the nation must learn that the path of justice is the only path of peace and safety.

LUCY STONE.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

THE first half of Mr. Francis Parkman's essay is devoted to a consideration of the difference of sex, in which he asserts—1. That the advocates of woman's rights deny that sex is based on differences rather than resemblances ; 2. That these differences set well-defined limitations to woman's activities, and make her inferior to man.

1. The advocates of woman's rights do not deny a difference in sex, but, on the contrary, base their strongest arguments for equal rights on this very principle, because of its mutually protecting, elevating, invigorating power over the sexes. But sex does not necessarily compel so broad a difference in the capacities and employments of men and women as some of Mr. Parkman's positions

would indicate, for the resemblances of sex are as great as their differences.

Darwin says that, in every female, all the secondary male characteristics, and, in every male, all the secondary female characteristics, exist in a latent form, ready to be evolved under certain conditions. Galton and Ribot, in their works on heredity, show that daughters more frequently inherit the characteristics of the father, and sons the characteristics of the mother. Since, then, physiological and psychological forces move in continuous circles, men and women can not be so absolutely different in their feelings and capacities as to require entirely separate spheres of action.

On this point Mr. Parkman himself says : " Whatever qualities of a woman are transmissible by inheritance, may descend to all her offspring alike. The male infant would be as apt to receive them as the female. The reciprocity between the two separate halves of human nature extends over a wide field, not only in passions and emotions, but in the regions of moral and intellectual life. Most intelligent men have felt the stimulus and refreshment of the faculties that spring from the companionship of an intelligent and congenial woman, and which is unlike anything resulting from the contact of a male mind. It is a fructifying power, with which neither the world of thought nor the world of action could well dispense. Many men of the higher sort recall as an epoch in their lives that wonderful awakening of energies, ambitions, and aspirations which comes with the first consciousness of the influence of the other sex."

And woman feels the same inspiring, invigorating power in the society of superior men : under such influence she is conscious of a clearer vision of great truths, before but dimly seen ; for, as there is just that physical difference in man and woman necessary for the preservation of the race, so there is just that psychical difference necessary to the vitalization of thought.

Why not, then, avail ourselves of these natural forces for the best development of men and women by closer association in the higher departments of thought and action ? The old idea of different spheres should now give place to the higher idea of different responsibilities in the same sphere. Wherever duty summons man, woman has a corresponding duty in the same place. If to war, man fights the battles, woman does good service in the hospitals. If to the home, the mother guides the household, the father supplements his home duties with some profitable occupation outside. When he

is inefficient, disabled, or dead, the mother fills both offices, as house-keeper and provider, and the facts of life show that this is no uncommon experience. And Mr. Parkman himself admits that, "between the life for which women alone are fit and that for which men alone are fit, there lies a region where both may prosper." As physicians, lawyers, pastors, teachers, laborers in many forms of industry, they now occupy the same positions as men, and as legislators there is no reason why they might not do equally good work for the state.

As women have ably filled all offices in life, "Nature's limitations" are yet to be discovered, unless we accept Mr. Parkman's physical encounters in "lonely places" with the lowest orders of manhood. And even here a right public sentiment would do much to insure woman's safety everywhere. You can not go so low down in the scale of being as to find a class of men who would desecrate our churches, profane the altars, and toss about the symbols of the sacrament, because they have been taught from their earliest infancy a holy reverence for the priesthood and their temples. But where are taught lessons of respect for woman? And yet, as mother of the race, she is more than churches, altars, symbols, priests, and, in her highest development, will do more to draw man from the hells to heaven than all other powers combined. I hold men in high places responsible for the outrages of the lower orders. The contemptuous phrases and unjust statutes for women learned in our law schools; the allegory of the creation of woman, the curse, the injunctions for her subjection studied in our theological schools; and the general tone of literature and the daily press, all tend to degrade woman in the mind of the masses. If all these influences were turned in the direction of justice, equality, and honor for woman, the moral atmosphere would soon be purified. The compass is not a surer guide for the mariner amid darkness and danger than the opinions of leading minds for the multitude. If our best men with pen and word would do for woman now what with their swords brave knights did in the age of chivalry, our daughters would soon be safe everywhere, alike in "lonely places" and the crowded marts of trade. Mrs. Chisholm's narrative shows too well that in the trying emergencies of life, prepared or unprepared, woman must learn to stand alone, and bravely meet danger and death. Chance insults from the lower orders are light indeed compared with those that are coined into laws and constitutions by our husbands, fathers, brothers, sons. No rude jest from an ignorant ruffian could so stir

a proud woman's blood as a well-written travesty on her sex from the pen of a man of learning and position.

2. Mr. Parkman clearly makes a difference of sex involve a general inferiority for woman. In the whole range of government, the most exalted of all sciences, he considers her incapable. When we contemplate the wide field thus covered—all our political, religious, educational, commercial, and social interests; the sanitary condition and the discipline of our cities, schools, asylums, jails, prisons, and homes—the question arises, Where is woman capable and where is her sphere of action, if she is to have no voice in the legislation on all these vital subjects? By quoting the opinions of two cultivated women on a given point where right is as clear as the sunlight, from their obtuseness Mr. Parkman argues a general deficiency in woman's moral perceptive faculties.

Again, though Mr. Parkman asserts that "women and not men are of necessity the guardians of the integrity of the family and the truth of succession," yet, even here, he makes "the family unit" man, who is to vote on all questions concerning the home. True, in his analysis of woman, Mr. Parkman refers to some "high and priceless qualities," but seems to take more delight in casting slurs at the ideal enfranchised woman. She is governed by "emotion" rather than by "reason," he informs us; that she is "impetuous," her will is "intractable," she is "impulsive," "excitable," full of "artfulness, effrontery, insensibility"; endowed with "a pushing self-assertion, and a glib tongue"; moved by "motives of love, pre-dilection, jealousy, or schemes of alliance"; she would possess "the cowardly courage of the virago," a "tongue more terrible than the sword," and would give vent to "shrill-tongued discussions," etc.

If this is the idea that the sons of the Pilgrims have of us, no wonder they are afraid to take the word "male" out of the Constitution and admit us to the political arena. But Mr. Parkman tells us that "a man's tongue is strong only as the organ of reason and eloquence." I would his pen were always strong in the same direction! But, had man's tongue through the ages been his only weapon of defense, it might also have come to be "more terrible than the sword." The honest testimony from one hundred families as to the self-control, sound reason, and lofty eloquence with which men use their tongues in domestic life—especially when asked for money—would afford some interesting statistics by which to estimate the comparative merits of the sexes in their general tone of conversation.

It may be confidently asserted, however, that woman has proved herself man's equal in all the great struggles of humanity. Always at a disadvantage on account of artificial burdens and restraints, she has, nevertheless, shown herself possessed of the same courage, intelligence, and moral elevation in all the varied trials she has been called upon to suffer. Brute force should be thrown out of this question, especially as among men our scholars, heroes, statesmen, and orators are so frequently small, delicately organized, and of the same sensitive, nervous temperament as the majority of women. The organism of woman is as complete as that of man. Because a man-of-war could sink one of our magnificent ocean-steamers, does not prove the former superior except for the one purpose of destruction. In the every-day uses of life the steamer has the advantage. The experiment of co-education has proved girls equal to boys in every department of learning.

"This nineteenth century," says Victor Hugo, "belongs to woman." She is stretching forth her hand, as never before, to grasp new power in all directions, and is close in the wake of man in the whole realm of thought and action. With telescopic vision she explores the starry firmament and brings back the history of the planetary world ; with chart and compass she pilots ships across the sea ; and with skillful fingers sends electric messages around the world. By her the virtues of humanity are immortalized on canvas, and dull blocks of marble are transformed into angels of light. In music she speaks again the language of Mendelssohn and Beethoven, and is a worthy interpreter of their great thoughts ; in poetry and romance she holds an equal place ; and has touched the key-note of reform in politics, religion, and social life. She fills the editor's and professor's chair, pleads at the bar of justice, and speaks from the pulpit and platform. Such is the type of womanhood the world welcomes to-day.

But a difference in sex has no more to do with the civil and political rights of a citizen than a difference in race ; and this brings us to the second part of Mr. Parkman's essay, in which he discusses woman suffrage *per se*. His objections may be summed up as follows : 1. Women do not want to vote ; the best would not, the worst would. 2. Women would debase politics rather than elevate it. 3. Woman suffrage would destroy the unity of the family. 4. If women vote, they must do military duty. 5. Woman suffrage would strengthen the Roman Catholic Church. 6. Woman

suffrage based on taxation is opposed to the genius of our Government. 7. Suffrage is not a natural right.

The first three points are answered by the fact, that though women are voting in England and Canada on municipal questions, in Wyoming Territory on the same conditions as men, in some of our States on school affairs, and are filling many offices under Government, the testimony of able and distinguished gentlemen as to the real results are, in all cases, favorable. These facts should outweigh Mr. Parkman's speculations. In Wyoming, where women have voted for nine years, the evidence shows that the best women do go to the polls, the worst do not ; that the women are governed by the highest moral considerations in discharging the great responsibilities of citizenship ; that family life has not been disturbed ; that the women have not become "nervous," "excitable," or "impulsive," but more calm, dignified, and sedate in assuming their new duties. On all these points the printed opinions of three successive Governors of the Territory, a Judge who sat on the Wyoming bench four years, the leading editors of the Territory, and prominent citizens of both sexes and of both parties, agree. The Hon. John W. Kingman, late Judge of the Wyoming Supreme Court, testified as follows before the Joint Special Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on woman suffrage in 1876 : "At our last election a larger proportion of women voted than of men. We have had no trouble from the presence of bad women at the polls. It has been said that the delicate and cultured women would shrink away, and the bold and indelicate come to the front in public affairs. This we feared ; but certainly nothing of the kind has happened. The women manifest a great deal of independence in their preference of candidates, and have frequently defeated bad nominations. They are becoming every year more and more interested in public affairs ; they are less under the influence of private interest, friendship, and party feeling, and are less subject to the temptations which bias the political action of men. As jurors women have done excellent service. They are less subject to the distracting influences which sometimes sway the action of men in the jury-box. With a stronger tension on the conscience, they seem more anxious to do right. On petit juries the women held the men up to a higher tone of morality and stricter sense of honesty than they would have exercised if left to themselves."

As regards the number of women who vote in England, the London "Examiner" says : "In sixty-six municipal elections, out

of every 1,000 women who enjoy equal rights with men on the register, 516 went to the poll, which is but forty-eight less than the proportionate number of men. And out of 27,949 women registered, where a contest occurred, 14,416 voted. Of men there were 166,781 on the register, and 90,080 at the poll."

3. To say that it would destroy the unity of the family to educate our daughters like our sons with a knowledge of the principles of political economy and constitutional law, and give them an equal right to express their opinions at the ballot-box, is a very serious reflection on the men of our households, and justifies John Stuart Mill's remark that "the generality of the male sex can not yet tolerate the idea of living with an equal." "The family unit" assumption is opposed to our republican idea of individual rights, to our Protestant tenet of private judgment and conscience. We might as well say that the family is a religious unit, as to assert that it is a political unit, and claim that the head must do the family repenting, praying, and confessing, and represent the family in the courts of heaven as well as at the polling-booth. The doctrine that the head of the family is alone destined for the joys of heaven and the woes of hell would relieve the minds of women and children from many gloomy forebodings. Fortunately for the honor of manhood, the experiment in Wyoming proves that woman suffrage does not destroy the peace of home. The editor of the *Laramie* (Wyoming) "Sentinel," in the number for December 16, 1878, says: "While women in this Territory frequently vote contrary to their husbands, we have never heard of a case where the family ties or domestic relations were disturbed by it; and we believe that among the pioneers of the West there is more honor and manhood than to abuse a wife because she does not think as we do about politics or religion."

4. As none of our constitutions make military capacity a qualification for suffrage, this point has no significance. The weakness of this trite objection can be easily shown by a glance at the large class of men who vote but never fight. All the office-holders under Government—and their name is legion—are exempt from military duty. So are the clergy, paupers, the Quakers, the lame, the halt and the blind; but each and all have the right to vote.

5. We are warned against the women of the Romish Church, so absolutely under the power of the priests, as a dangerous element in our free institutions if permitted to vote. The same fear is sometimes expressed in regard to Protestant women: they would destroy

the secular nature of our Government if given the ballot. If women were enfranchised, they would not be priest-ridden. Too much of their activity is now confined to the churches. Throw politics open to woman, and you weaken the hold of the Church upon her.

6. If suffrage based on taxation is opposed to the genius of our Government, is not taxation without representation equally opposed to it?

7. Suffrage is a natural right. The right of self-government, of self-protection, the right to defend one's person and property, to secure life, liberty, and happiness, not a natural right? It is the key-stone of the arch on which rests our temple of liberty. In a warm debate on the Fourteenth Amendment in the Senate a member said, "Suffrage is a political right, that the few may give or withhold at their pleasure." "Let that idea," replied Sumner, "crystallize in the minds of our people and we have rung the death-knell of American liberties." To deny this principle takes all significance from the grand debates of the century on human rights that culminated in our civil war! In the most celebrated document which has been put forth on this side of the Atlantic, our ancestors declare that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This principle, oftentimes repeated by distinguished statesmen and eminent jurists, in varied forms and language, as far back as Blackstone, should find a ready response in the mind of every American citizen.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

"MR. WENDELL PHILLIPS" never claimed that the question of the rights of women "should be treated without regard to sex," as an article in the last "North American" avers. I never knew any one who made such a claim; and certainly no one who could fairly be considered a representative advocate of woman suffrage ever was guilty of such absurdity. Any one has, of course, the right to discuss the plan of woman's suffrage. But no one should state or discuss the views or arguments of those who claim that right for her without first acquainting himself with the literature of the subject—with the arguments actually urged by such claimants. It is a singular circumstance, one not very suggestive of the honesty of our opponents, or of any great trust in their cause, that they seldom

consider themselves bound to know what we really say or urge. Like the worthy German with his camel, they hold themselves at liberty to "evolve our arguments from the depths of their own consciousness." No wonder, therefore, that the result is absurd, or that the absurdity is not our fault. The paper I have quoted is an elaborate picture, and a not very exaggerated one, of the vast difference between the nature of men and that of women. I have known that difference just as forcibly presented in Woman's Rights Conventions and the pages of woman's suffrage advocates. It is, indeed, one of the chief grounds of our claim for woman suffrage. Supported by Plato and most of the great intellects of the race, we affirm that woman is man's equal, though unlike him. This, second to the right of every human being to be governed by laws which he has agreed to, is our main argument for woman suffrage.

Abraham Lincoln said, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other man's consent." When we include wisdom in the idea of goodness, the proposition is clearly true. But, if some should doubt its truth, hardly any American would deny that no *class* of men is wise or good enough to govern another class. Each class knows its own rights, strength, weakness, interests, and needs as no other class can know them. Hence the laws needed to unfold and protect those rights and interests are best known by that class, and its actual presence in the political arena is the best, if not the only, means of securing proper legislation. This is one of the grounds for universal manhood suffrage. Very few Americans have the impertinence to affirm that students could legislate for merchants better than they themselves can ; that traders know best what is good and necessary for farmers ; and that capitalists are just the men to make laws for workingmen.

But when we come to women—one half of the human race—men insist that women are wholly different from themselves in qualities, capacity, and nature ; and then go on to claim that *therefore* they, the men, are the best fitted to legislate for women, and indeed the only persons to do it. Man undertakes to affirm, not only that woman can not understand man, but that he—man—understands woman and man equally well ; which is certainly modest. Woman is a wholly different being from man, is she ? Then man can not know how to vote for her. One of two things is true: either woman is like man—and if she is, then a ballot based on brains belongs to her as well as to him ; or she is different, and then man does not know how to vote for her as well as she herself does. She

is a human being, for she earns wages and holds property; and you tax both. She can transgress laws, and you fine and imprison her when she does. She is not so intellectually feeble but that you trust her with forming the first seven or ten years—the most important ones—of her child's life; and you commit to her two thirds of all the schools.

Holding these facts in view I ask, What is suffrage? It is an opinion, or judgment, touching the best course to be pursued, in particular circumstances, by the state. This opinion is collected, by votes, from all the elements which make up the state. Civilization in this country believes, and it everywhere else tends to the belief, that the greater the number of elements consulted, the wiser such opinion is likely to be. Hence we consult wealth and poverty, book-learning and practical life, youth and age, leisure and toil. We have come to the conclusion not only that the broader the base of the structure, the securer it stands—the more content there will be among the masses, and the more hearty rallying to support the laws—but we have found that the laws themselves are wiser and more just, and the conduct of the state better and nobler.

Why should this experience of the last three centuries be put aside when we come to woman—a tax-payer; amenable to penal law; and the teacher of the race? Grant that man is judgment, and woman impulse; man is justice, and woman sentiment; that man is logic, and woman instinct.

What of it? Woman does, nevertheless, after all, make just one half of the state. It is conformity and fit relation to her “impulse, sentiment, and instinct” that make the laws just or unjust, foolish or wise. Shall we succeed better in securing such conformity by consulting women, or by ignoring them? There can be but one answer to such a question by any fair man who really believes in the American doctrine of universal manhood suffrage. Some men object to woman suffrage from caprice, superstition, or narrow prejudice. From such we do not, of course, expect argument. But no fair, hearty advocate of universal manhood suffrage has ever urged against us anything that deserves the name of an argument. Every such attempt betrays, as does the plea we are considering, that the real objection is to the American doctrine of universal suffrage itself. “High civilization, ancient or modern, has hitherto rested on the family. . . . To give the suffrage to women would be to reject the principle that has thus far formed the basis of civilized government.” And it is an American who writes this!

affirming that there has been neither "high civilization" nor "civilized government" in this country, where everything in civil affairs has always rested, not on the family, but on the individual!

"There are those who think that the suffrage would act as a safety-valve to political passions; but it has not so acted in the case of men." And this, too, is written by an American, in a land where universal suffrage, speaking generally, has prevailed for a century; and where, in consequence of it, the quiet submission of millions of disappointed voters, in their angriest mood, to the decision of the ballot, has been the wonder of the world!—submission the rule in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases, and resistance the exception in the thousandth. Of course, one might as well cite Bedlam as claim the South for an exception.

If such be his feeling toward manhood suffrage, no wonder our friend dreads extending it to women. But this surely does not justify misstating history.

Says Disraeli, in "*Vivian Grey*," "The people are not often wrong"—one may add, the people are always just. History is one unvarying record of the plots of the few to wrong the many. How very rare on its pages is any note of an attempt by the many to wrong the few! I might almost challenge the production of one such; even the French Revolution, fairly interpreted, does not offer one. The precedent of our fathers, in 1776, confiscating Tory estates, covers and sanctions every act of "mob law," so called, in Paris.

"The right of voting," says our critic, "and the duty of fighting should never be divorced." Since "law with no power to enforce it is futile and sometimes ridiculous." Just in the same way and with the same truth, some say the right of voting and the possession of wealth should never be divorced, because law with no power to enforce it is ridiculous, and in these days neither can war be made nor government sustained without money. Hence wealthy men are the only ones entitled to vote on a question of going to war!—a conclusion to which this fighting objection to woman suffrage irresistibly brings one. If you say this is not fair, and does not cover the case, since poor men must do the actual fighting—grant that, and still the cases are exactly parallel. For in the creation of that public opinion which sustains law and makes war hearty and vigorous, in all the sacrifices war necessitates and all the burdens it entails, woman shares with man, more than equally in many cases. Hence, if the capitalist furnishes the means for war and government, and the masses furnish the men, woman contributes

largely to the inspiration that upholds both, and shares more than equally in the burdens they entail. In the days of barbarism and of feudalism—its eldest born—when every man was especially trained to fight and only to fight, and when the chief business of government was to conduct wars, this argument might have had weight. But now when the great questions are tariffs, capital and labor, penal laws, posts, education, sanitary methods, telegraphs and railways, movement of harvests and means of communication—in one word, social science—how does a fitness to judge on such questions depend on the ability to fight? Can not an educated woman judge them as wisely as the man who digs your sewer or shovels your sidewalk? And as for the wives of such laborers, they are, every one knows, generally by far the superiors, intellectually, of their husbands. The tie between voting and fighting broke the moment nations became civilized and hired armies to do their fighting.

Our critic is so little familiar with the literature of the subject as to fancy us maintaining that women are better than men. We never dreamed of such folly. We do not care to deny that in the royal instances he cites the queens would have been as bad as the kings actually were, had those queens had the opportunity. Women are neither better nor worse than men. The sexes incline to different vices, but yield about equally, each to its special temptations. We do not expect that woman suffrage will purify politics because woman is better than man. Our expectation of improvement from her sharing political action rests on a different ground.

If we look at the history of the race, its customs and institutions, we shall see one thread running through all its warp and woof. It is this rule or principle: whatsoever has been ever done or attempted by one separate sex has always, in some degree, failed, and in the effort the sex itself has deteriorated. The best work mankind has ever done has come from the sexes working together and in company. Not because either one is better than the other, but God seems to have appointed that the mutual action and reaction of the two on each other shall always give the best result.

I need not refer to the separate religious training of nun and monk—but take art in Greece. It was in the hands of men only, and its productions, set in the streets where Greek decorum forbade women to appear, were never meant to be judged by women. Perfect as art was in the hands of Phidias, some of its rare pieces are hidden to-day from general sight in the locked chambers of the mu-

seums ; and through the streets of some Greek cities no woman of modern modesty could walk. Thorwaldsen, Canova, Chantrey, or Flaxman, never carves marble that might not stand in parlor or church. They carve, as did not the Greek, with the ever-present, unconscious thought that mothers, wives, and sisters will judge their works. This is the secret of art's purification. Take literature. From the Greek down through Chaucer to Shakespeare, we expurgate before we read the old drama and novel in our parlors. But Sophocles was as white a soul as Tennyson, and Chaucer lived on a higher plane than Dickens. Why can you read every line of the two moderns to your daughter, while you expurgate the Greek and the old poet of "pure English undefiled"? In those earlier days woman was no reader ; at the play she was rarely a spectator. Poet and playwright never contemplated her as critic or judge ; and they sank, as those always do who minister to the pleasure of one sex.

Take *society*, the only field where the sexes have ever met on terms of equality, the arena where character is formed and studied, the cradle and the realm of public opinion, the crucible of ideas, the world's university, at once a school and a theatre, the spur and the crown of ambition, the tribunal which unmasks pretension and stamps real merit, the power that gives government leave to be, and outruns the lazy Church in fixing the moral sense of the age. Who shall fitly describe the lofty place of this element in the history of the last three centuries? And yet this is the realm of woman—the throne which, like a conqueror, she first founded and then filled.

There was nothing like it—no parlor—in Greece. Woman was ornament and drudge ; never but once companion—and Aspasia, by only being such, lost her good name. There was no parlor in the middle ages. Woman was toy, plaything, idol, and slave ; but never companion. The castle had no parlor.

Why are men *feted* in politics whom you would never invite to your parlor, never ask to associate with your daughters? Why are men tolerated, ay, honored, in parties, and on 'Change, whom society sends to Coventry? If one said to you, "I have done nothing to deserve the State Prison, why don't you invite me to your house?" how contemptuously you would answer : "Don't you know that you may be a thousand miles above the State Prison, and yet a thousand miles below my parlor ; since law works on a very different plane from that of society!" Men whom the Church dares

not excommunicate, society spews out of its mouth, and stamps base metal.

Why is all this? Because in society men and women act and live together in the very finest possible relations. And hence it outruns the statute-book and leads the Church; judging its ranks by no rude, coarse law which a male majority puts on the statute-book, by no obsolete and routine morality, but by the invisible essence and spirit of honor, delicate, high-toned, fearless; obeying always the last, highest conception or aspiration of human nature.

Society is a broader family, which is the model and example God gives us; where brothers and sisters live and work, grow and unfold together in the very best of circumstances and relations.

How, then, do I plan to purify politics? I will lift it to the level of the home and the parlor, always the highest level of the age. What revenge could a defeated candidate take on his successful rival more bitter or cruel than to explain, in that rival's parlor, to his humbled wife and daughters, the exact trick by which he succeeded, and for which the caucus rang with his praise?

Woman is no better than man; but man and woman together are the perfect human being, the highest moral and intellectual force. Hence we do not only claim her right to vote, but exact it of her as her duty to civilization and society. Indeed, our opponents gave up the whole argument when they cut loose from Constantinople and the harem; when they let woman go to church and choose her creed. The American woman will meet at the ballot-box the same men she sees in the lecture-room, the church, the theatre, the cars, and the public streets. We have outgrown Jewish, Greek, and Turkish barbarism; and hence, long used to respect woman's presence in those places, the vast majority of men obey there the laws of decency and good manners. No husband, this side of Turkey, objects to his wife's presence in theatre, car, church, or street, because some rare miscreant may possibly insult or offend her there. Indeed, I may go further: the very bully who knocks your hat over your eyes at the polls would turn you out of his house if you uttered there a word disrespectful to his wife. He knows what is due to woman: let his wife go to the polls, and the rudest man will learn to carry his good manners there.

None so simple as to dream that we are increasing the influence of woman. That is already omnipotent. I would rather lessen it. I am interested in this question because I wish to put recognized and responsible power where there already exists unrecognized influence.

Unrecognized influence is always dangerous ; it is unheeded and unwatched, uneducated and irresponsible. I want it dragged to the light of day, measured, criticised, and held to its full responsibility. "It is the mothers and daughters of France," says Tocqueville, "who have wrecked some of our noblest movements to help the millions," and he traces it to their hidden and almost resistless influence acting unwatched, behind the scenes, under no sense of responsibility, open to no argument or appeal as to the forces they are setting in motion.

"Measures," says Demosthenes, "which the statesman has meditated a whole year may be overturned in a day by a woman." You can not abolish wives, nor sisters, nor mothers; hence you can not destroy woman's influence. In self-defense, therefore, add open responsibility where there exists unobserved and irresponsible power.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.